



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

copy of circular containing information as to purpose, membership, etc., of the Ohio Association, and also the Constitution adopted by that body:

At the last meeting of the Association of Ohio Colleges, Dec. 27, 1889, a number of Professors of Modern Languages met at Columbus, to form an organization for the purpose of improving the methods, and raising the standard of instruction in Modern Languages (English, French, German, etc.) in the schools and colleges of Ohio. A permanent organization was effected, a constitution adopted, and officers elected. The name of the Association is THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF OHIO. JAMES MORGAN HART, President, University of Cincinnati; HUGO SCHILLING, Vice-President, Wittenberg College; ERNST A. EGGERS, Secretary and Treasurer, Ohio State University. The Association is to meet every year, on the occasion of the meeting of the Association of Ohio Colleges, or at such other place as the Executive Committee may designate. You are cordially invited to join this organization. Will you be so kind as to communicate the contents of this circular to any one interested in the study of Modern Languages? Applications for membership, or other communications, should be addressed to ERNST A. EGGERS, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

CONSTITUTION.—I. The Name of this Association shall be THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF OHIO.—II. Any one engaged in the teaching of Modern Languages in the State of Ohio may become a member of the Association, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee.—III. The object of the Association shall be to improve the methods, and raise the standard of instruction in Modern Languages in the schools and colleges of Ohio.—IV. The officers of the Association shall be a President, Vice-President, and Secretary, who shall also act as Treasurer. These officers shall constitute the Executive Committee, and shall be elected annually by the Association.—V. The Executive Committee shall have charge of the general interests of the Association, such as the election of members, calling of meetings, selection of papers to be read, and regulation of proceedings.—VI. This Constitution may be amended at any annual meeting by a two-thirds vote of the members present. The annual dues are fixed at \$1.00.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

#### NOTES ON RHETORIC.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Allow me to say a few words in

reply to PROF. J. M. HART, who in the January number of MOD. LANG. NOTES discusses some of my "Notes on Rhetoric."

First of all I wish to express my regret that I did not remember, until it was too late to remedy my error, that PROF. JOHN S. HART was "no longer able to defend himself." The sentence, however, that I took from his Rhetoric did not in my opinion need any defence. I can point out the same construction in THACKERAY, DE QUINCEY, BURKE, and a multitude of other writers: it does not seem to me a solecism.

But the reasons that PROF. J. M. HART says his father assigned for condemning the locutions "and which" and "and who," and approving the locution "but which," I cannot wholly accept. These reasons are:—

I. "John S. Hart was opposed to all such locutions as 'and who,' 'and which,' etc. He held that they were pleonastic. In merely appositional and cumulative clauses, 'and' is superfluous; thus, 'I once knew a boy of good parts, faithful, attentive, *and* who carried off all the prizes.' Why the 'and'? It adds nothing to the expression."

Now I agree with PROF. HART that where the *who* or *which* clause merely *defines*, the "and" is superfluous; but, in the sentence from PROF. HILL's 'Rhetoric' which I criticised, the "and who" clause *adds* some information about the "party"; and the "and" is necessary to avoid ambiguity: "The approach of the party, *sent* for the purpose of compelling the country people to bury their dead, *and who* had already assembled several peasants, obliged Edward, etc." Let me illustrate my meaning by the following examples:—

1. "A boy of fine education, *who* has been well trained in ancient and modern learning, is not likely to fail." Here "and" before "who" would be incorrect, because the "who" clause merely explains "of fine education."

2. "I gave him a piece of bread, light in weight but very black, *which* he ate." Here again "and" before the relative would be incorrect, because "the relative serves not so much to periphrase an attribute as to connect a fact": *which*=*and it* (cf. MAETZNER, vol. iii,

p. 533). And this sentence resembles very closely the one cited by PROF. HART.

3. "Boys superior in diligence to all their school-mates, *and who* afterwards win honors at Oxford, receive great praise at Eton."\* Here, working "from the inner thought outwards," I should say that, whether we prefer to write "superior" or "who are superior," the "and" is necessary: it *adds* something required by the sense, and to omit it would create ambiguity as to the antecedent of "who," which might then naturally refer to "school-mates."

I am not opposed, therefore, to *all* such locutions as "and who," "and which," etc. The sentence that I quoted from PROF. HILL is not touched by PROF. HART's remarks on the "superfluous and." On close examination of the sentence from MR. LOWELL, I am willing to concede to PROF. HART that the "and" may be omitted, for it so happens that, the "lower classes" being only another name for "our senses," these two expressions may change places, thus bringing the "which" next to its antecedent. To my mind, however, the sentence could be written more smoothly and forcibly as follows: "It is important for us to instruct and refine our senses, *which are* the lower classes of our body politic, *and which*, if left to their own instincts, will destroy the Commonwealth."

II. As to the construction "but who," "but which," PROF. HART says: "In adversative clauses, on the other hand, the sequence of thought is broken, hence there should be a corresponding break of expression." This opinion, which PROF. J. M. HART quotes from his father, I cannot accept. If it means anything, it means that the following is an incorrect sentence: "The boy who helped me yesterday, but who refused to helped me to day, is my brother." (!) It is true that such a rule would justify the following: "Other fields, perhaps not barren, but which can yield, etc."; but if this sentence be correct, it is correct in virtue of the natural ellipsis that

\*DEAN ALFORD chooses to confuse such sentences as I have given under (3) with the following and similar vulgarisms: "Please send me a copy of the SHAKESPEARE Memorial, *and for which* I enclose a shilling." This, in my judgement, he has no right to do. The sentences are totally different

has been made. PROF. HILL regards "and which" and "but which" as the same solecism.

PROF. J. M. HART does not seem to accept this rule for adversative clauses, for he adds: "If there be any fault in the above, it lies in the omission of 'which are,' rather than in the use of 'but which.' The 'but' is needed to indicate contrast."

On this point I have never differed with PROF. HART. The only question is whether the 'which are' is necessary. In conclusion I hope I may plead innocent "of criticising sentences by *arbitrary* rules from without inwards," unless that be an arbitrary rule which HORACE laid down: *Usus, quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi*. To usage, reputable, national, and present, we must all bow.

JNO. R. FICKLEN.

*Tulane University of Louisiana.*

#### A FRENCH LITERARY WEEKLY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Various inquiries having reached me in regard to a suitable weekly newspaper, in French, which should represent the current literary movement in France, I think that mention of the subject may interest many readers of the MOD. LANG. NOTES. I have been a subscriber for three years to the *Annales politiques et littéraires* (15 rue Saint-Georges, Paris, 7. fr. 50) and have found it, on the whole, the most satisfactory organ for the indication of the various literary and artistic currents of Parisian life. Yet, being designed particularly for the provinces of France, many things are lacking in this publication which are evidently supplied, in the respective *départements*, by the local dailies; as, for example, a special chronicle of the literary events of the week and a necrology of leading authors and of university men. The necessity, on the part of teachers of French, of keeping in touch with the changes of French thought and expression, is so obvious, that information on this point would be very acceptable. Is there a publication which answers our needs?

F. M. WARREN.

*Johns Hopkins University.*